

***Village of Barrington  
Plan Commission  
Minutes Summary***

Date: January 30, 2003

Time: 7 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room  
200 South Hough Street  
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Anna Bush, Chair  
Curt Larsen, Vice Chair  
Bhagwant Sidhu  
Harry Burroughs  
Steve Mack  
Steve Morrissey

Staff Members: Keith Sbiral, Planner  
Melanie Marcordes, Recording Secretary

***Call To Order***

The special meeting of the Plan Commission was called to order by Chairperson Bush at approximately 7:00 p.m., on Thursday, January 30, 2003.

***Roll Call***

Upon a roll call, the following members were present: Commissioners Harry Burroughs, Bhagwant Sidhu, and Stephen Mack; Vice-Chairperson Curt Larsen, and Chairperson Anna Bush.

***PC 02-10; Heart-Key Development (Listhartke Annexation and Subdivision) 64-70 North Ela Road***

***Also Present:***

Bill Graft, Law Offices of Graft, Jordan, Curtis  
Tom Jordan, Law Offices of Graft, Jordan, Curtis  
Charlie Crump, DLK Landscape Architects  
Keith Lacy, Barrington Engineering Consultants  
Members of Listhartke Family

Chairperson Bush swore in any public and petitioners who expected to speak during the Public Hearing.

Chairperson Bush requested and received notices of the Special Meeting/Public Hearing.

Mr. Bill Graft gave a presentation and history of the Listhartke family and property. The Petitioner is seeking an Annexation into the Village; a Rezoning from R-1 to R-3 single-family residential district to include a 14 lot residential subdivision; and a Special Use Planned Development.

Mr. Graft demonstrated the evolution of the different plans and how they came to fruition. The Petitioner originally presented a plan to Village staff and based on staff's recommendation, they presented a plan to the neighborhoods that illustrated a connection to Lake Shore Drive South. After listening to concerns from the area residents, the Petitioner revised their plan to *not* contain a connection to Lake Shore Drive. Mr. Graft noted that all lots are in full conformity with the Zoning Ordinance and Village codes.

Mr. Tom Jordan, Law Offices of Graft, Jordan & Curtis, summarized the results of the neighborhood meetings. The biggest issue was the connection to Lake Shore Drive. He noted again that the connection to Lake Shore Drive was removed from the plan. Other neighbor issues included stormwater management, water and sewer, removal of trees, pedestrian/ bike path connections to other neighborhoods, and access to Ela Road.

Keith Lacy, Barrington Engineering Consultants, 215 S. Northwest Highway, noted that the Petitioner's plan met all of the requirements of the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance and that no variations are being sought.

Mr. Charlie Crump, DLK Architects, 410 S. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, presented the landscape plans for the proposed subdivision and indicated his intent to work closely the Mike Szymanski, Village Forester, before proceeding to remove any trees or finalize plans.

Mr. Graft noted again that the Petitioner is not seeking a connection to Lake Shore Drive. He apologized that the process with the Village was not more clear and apologized for the miscommunication.

Mr. Graft noted that the only item in the Comprehensive Plan that was not being adhered to was the clustering of the homes. The Petitioner did not feel that clustering would be appropriate for this site and that maintaining consistency with surrounding neighbors would be more appropriate.

***Public Comment:***

Jane O'Neil – 530 Lake Shore Drive North – represents 411 homes – Formerly submitted a petition containing 461 signatures, representing 289 homes (74% of homes in Fox Point). Ms. O'Neil indicated that she was happy that an alternate plan was presented (excluding the connection to Lake Shore Drive) but expressed concern with drainage and the tree lines for the neighbors.

Kathy Sullivan – 240 Tall Trees Drive – Expressed concern with the fact that the Petitioner wants to use an off-site detention pond due to the already existing flooding issues. Concern was expressed with moving the trees and digging into the retention pond. Ms. Sullivan questioned who owns the retention pond. – Jim Wallace, Director of Building and Planning, noted that staff will have to review, but believes the retention pond is maintained by the Homeowner's Association. The Petitioner responded that the plan is to stay only on Lishartke owned property. They are using a pipe that drains from Tall Trees, but will not be using Tall Trees property.

Ms. Sullivan also asked to define "insignificant" trees. Mr. Crump indicated that the terms "key" and "significant" are terms used by arborist to survey trees. The Petitioner stressed that regardless of how the trees on the site are classified; the developer will try to preserve as many trees as possible. Chairperson Bush noted that the Village has a Tree Preservation Ordinance that must be adhered to. Chairperson Bush noted that if anyone had specific questions regarding tree preservation that they should contact Mike Szymanski, Village Forester, for additional help.

Ms. Sullivan indicated that the residents of Tall Trees were concerned that the proposal is too dense. The Petitioner noted that the proposed subdivision is less dense than Tall Trees, or Fox Point.

Ms. Sullivan indicated that the residents of Tall Trees would also like to see a sidewalk to continue along Lake Cook Road to Tall Trees Drive and continue up to Ela. This would create a community.

Ms. Sullivan added a personal note about the School District funding and how the referendums keep getting voted down and that any impact fee paid by the developer should go directly to Lines School and not just to the School District.

Jeff Gardner – 529 Fox Glove Lane, representing 17 families – Stated that the five key issues for Fox Glove Lane residents include physical impact, safety, property values, community connections, and annexation.

Larry Wendt – 525 Fox Glove Lane – 28-year resident indicated concern with drainage where there is currently a flooding problem.

Eric Holstein – Fox Glove Lane – addressed physical impact, traffic and construction. He is disappointed in lack of consideration the community received from the Petitioner. Residents were not asked to voice their concerns until mid-January and are skeptical of good faith of developers. Wants assurances that what the Developer has presented this evening is true. Mr. Holstein indicated that he does not want construction traffic to use Fox Glove Lane; they should use Ela Road. Construction workers should not use Fox Glove Lane for parking during construction. An extension of Fox Glove Lane could double the existing traffic. Need permanent solution (i.e. traffic light at Ela) – if Subdivision approved. Mr. Holstein sees no need to connect Fox Glove Lane to new road.

Chairperson Bush asked for copies of Mr. Holstein's presentation and graphic.

Alexa Horowitz – 542 Fox Glove Lane – Noted that this proposal does not positively affect existing neighborhood. There is concern about safety with additional traffic and unfamiliar faces.

Craig Panasy – 531 Fox Glove Lane – 5 year resident – Addressed property values – Concerned that the development will decrease the value of our homes. The plan to connect these roads will eliminate trees in the area and decrease the privacy that residents currently have. Mr. Panasy indicated the desire for assurances that the new development should be of similar size and architectural style to the existing Fox Glove Subdivision. Mr. Panasy indicated a concern with the impact the development would have on existing utilities (i.e. water pressure). Preserve existing trees as much as possible, minimize impact on utilities; safeguard the quality of our neighborhoods.

Matt Osowski – 541 Fox Glove Lane – Would like bike paths and pedestrian paths connecting to Tall Trees and Fox Point allowing for a connection to schools, downtown, etc.

Judy Marquith – 521 N. Ela Road – Addressed annexation issues – The whole parcel (including the 2 - 3 acres not included) should be annexed. Non-inclusion of remaining property limits what could happen on that parcel in the future.

Jeff Gardner – 529 Fox Glove Lane – Summarized the issues of the residents of Fox Glove and submitted a copy of a petition representing 100% of the Fox Glove Residents.

Tom Mueller – 20331 Deer Park – Addressed drainage issues. The culvert to the east of Ela Road is in disrepair and should be repaired before allowing the developer to build. This issue has also been brought before Deer Park and was referred to an Intergovernmental Agreement between the two Villages. Mr. Mueller indicated his concern with traffic and access on getting out at Ela Road.

Cynthia Vervinski – 1521 Lake Shore Drive South – Four issues: 1. Plan that was presented showed pipe that would require removing trees. 2. All of property to the west is lower – what kind of guarantee is there that water flow will be addressed? 3. It looked as if the water from the front of the homes is being directed to retention ponds – what happens to the water in the back of the houses? 4. Bike Path – does not want a bike path that comes into a dead end as it can be an attractive nuisance.

Keith Lacy, Engineer – Explained how the water gets into the retention pond. – Today, some of the property drains into other properties without being detained. Now, it is engineered to go into retention pond, replacing and improving the existing situation on the property.

Mr. Lacy also responded to a question that was brought up earlier regarding water pressure and made assurances that the pressure would not be negatively impacted.

Jerry O'Neil – 530 Lake Shore Drive North – Concern that berms (retention ponds) are attractive nuisances.

Mr. Thalheimer – 521 Lake Shore Drive North – Lake Louise in Fox Point. Residents have spent \$550,000 to maintain this lake. Residents are looking for assurances that silt and dirt will not go into the lake.

Jim Perille – 514 Lake Shore Drive North – backs up to Fox Glove Lane. Unfortunate that the development requires two major basins with only fourteen homes. Homeowners are expected to take care of this. Usually you have a much larger Homeowner's Association to maintain public areas. The least obtrusive way to handle the lane is to come in directly from Ela. Construction traffic is issue. Although it says in the Comprehensive Plan that this should be annexed, it is a privilege, not a right. Mr. Perille indicated that impact on schools and the density of the proposal are both an issue. The Developer needs to make sure there will be no flooding. Ponds are a real concern. Preserve the trees. Another reason to consider not annexing is the drain on the water facilities. Time has come that you have to worry about where our water is going to come from. It's a mistake to give Village water away. This will add another burden, and the Village will have to add major new facilities.

Village Trustee Jeanne Yeagley – 866 South Country Drive – Trustee Yeagley indicated that she has an issue with Mr. Graft saying "what they are entitled to do" and indicated to Mr. Graft that he is not entitled to do anything just because it's in our Comprehensive Plan. The residents have been reasonable and have been overly generous. If this

project were to be developed in an unincorporated area, it would only be allowed approximately 8 homes. Trustee Yeagley suggested building a pocket park for the surrounding neighborhoods. The nice side of the house should be facing the street. Ela Road is an area where you need to consider a nice buffer. Put the park on Ela Road. Luxury homes are not consistent with the homes in this area. The thing that makes a luxury home in Barrington Hills is the large lot sizes. The impact to the school district should be looked at. Trustee Yeagley has been begging Village Manager Robert Irvin to include the impact fee ordinance on a Village Board agenda, and he has continually ignored her requests.

Resident (did not identify himself) – Asked for confirmation that the Village is withdrawing its demand that the Developer pursue the connection to Lake Shore Drive.

Keith Sbiral, Village Planner, indicated that the Village did not demand anything of the petitioner. During the technical review phase, staff recommended that a connection be investigated. There is no demand to withdraw.

Mr. Bill Graft indicated, again, that the developer is not pursuing a connection to Lake Shore Drive.

The Public Hearing was continued until March 12, 2003 at 7:00 p.m. Keith Sbiral indicated that the submittal deadline for that meeting would be February 19<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Steve Mack moved and Vice-Chairperson Larsen seconded a motion to adjourn the Plan Commission meeting of January 30, 2003 at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Melanie Marcordes  
Administrative Assistant

---

Anna Bush, Chairperson  
Plan Commission